Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

98 1937 JUN 3 - 1999

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. _____

In The
United States Supreme Court
AMERICA

October Term, 1998

EILEEN VEY

V.

Tom Ridge, Governor of PA,
PA Governor, et. al.

Petition For
WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT
Rule 11 Case Expedition Requested

Eileen Vey
804 Cedar Avenue
Pittsburgh PA 15212 U.S.A.
TEL/FAX (412) 322-3131

TRP

QUESTION PRESENTED

I.

SHOULD THE BUILDING OF AN UNJUSTIFIED STADIUM IN PITTSBURGH BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY, BECAUSE OF DEFRAUDATION OF TAXPAYERS' AND FEDERAL MONEY, DESTRUCTION OF PITTSBURGH HISTORIC HERITAGE AND EMINENT DOMAIN.

II.

DOES FORCING URINE TESTS VIOLATE A PERSON'S RIGHTS CONCERNING SEARCH AND SEIZURE, MEDICAL PRIVACY, SEXUAL HARRASSMENT, FEMALES RIGHTS TO BODY PRIVACY, BODY PRIVACY IDENTITY, AND DISEASE CONTROL HAZARDS, ETC.

III.

SHOULD TOBACCO BE DECLARED ILLEGAL, DUE TO IT'S DEADLY TOXINS TO OTHERS AND ATMOSPHERE.

IV.

IS IT ILLEGAL TO DENY GRANDPARENTS AND GRANDCHILDREN VISITATION RIGHTS.

PARTIES INVOLVED

The parties involved here are Eileen Vey, Tom Ridge, PA Governor, and PA Parole Board Director.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subject	Page
List of Parties	i
Table of Contents	ii
Petition For Certiorari	1
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	1
U.S. Constitutional Provisions	2
Statement of Case	2
REASON FOR GRANTING WRIT	2
Conclusion	4

****

No. _____

In The
United States Supreme Court
AMERICA

October Term, 1998

Eileen Vey
v.
Tom Ridge, Governor of PA,
Governor of Pennsylvania

Petition For
Writ of Certiorari
To The Third Circuit

The Petitioner, Eileen Vey, requests that a Writ of Ceritorari to the Third Circuit be granted (Imperative Public Importance).

ORDERS BELOW

The U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania issued the March 31, 1999 Order denying Vey's state case, No. 99-496 (Appendix 1). In May 20, 1999 the Third Circuit Appeal of case, No. 99-3287, was withdrawn, however, is being continued and is pending in the Third Circuit for a decision (Appendix 2).

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction is envoked under 28 USC § 2101 (e) and Rule 11, because the case is of imperative public importance, while it pends in the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, where there is a Judge shortage and will take some months according to report.

U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, ETC.

The U.S. Constitutional provisions are Article I § 9 (2), Amendments 2, 4, 13, et cetera.

STATEMENT OF CASE

Jurisdiction in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania was invoked under 28 USC §§ 1331, 1358, 1392, 2254, which was docketed as Eileen Vey, Th.D. vs Tom Ridge Governor of PA, PA Governor, et al, Civil Action No. 99-496, and which on March 31, 1999 was DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE, by same Honorable Judge Lee, who has been dismissing all Vey's cases, 28 USC §§ 144, 455(d) (1), cases all related, all these years. On April 1, 1999 Vey Appealed case in the U.S. District Court (WD of PA) to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, which was docketed Eileen Vey v. Tom Ridge, Governor of PA, PA Governor, et al, No. 99-3287.

On April 20, 1999 the Third Circuit Clerk Close case, because Vey withdrew Appeal due to pending other litigation, et cetera. Vey reopened, closed and is presently continuing case still pending a decision in the Third Circuit concerning Motions Closings and Opening Case, IFP, Summary Judgment and Expedition of Appeal, with the last motion by Vey being that of May 15, 1999, Motion To Continue Case.

REASON FOR GRANTING WRIT

The court should grant writ of certiorari for reasons that the writ is of Imperative Public Importance (Rule 11) as listed below.

COMPLAINT CONTENT

In brief, Vey filed a complaint again declaring to the state that she is in "illegal custody" to the PA Parole Board and that forcing her to take a urine against her will after seven (7) years on state parole without one was illegal and a contract breach by PA Governor Ridge. Additionally, she complained that it was a life-threatening situation going to the State Building where heavy tobacco smoke at entrance can jeopardize her life and health,

after substantiating claim with Medical Orders to Parole.

Furthermore, Vey contended that if Governor Ridge would break that state contract, then he is not trustworthy in contracts concerning the new stadium, which he is involved in building.

Moreover, the building of the new stadium is not justified, since it is destroying Pittsburgh historic heritage (redesigning Pittsburgh), people have been reportedly leaving Pittsburgh city more than any city in nation and there is a new stadium (30 years) already there (Vey's neighborhood).

Since Vey did not receive the Injunctive relief to stop her from taking a urine, she was violated horribly (listed below) with being forced to take one under threat of imprisonment. Moreover, the state is prohibiting Vey from seeing her grandchildren in Ohio, where the law prohibits anyone from refusing grandparents from seeing their grandchildren and where the husband of her daughter is refusing Vey from seeing her grandchildren, two who are not even his!

THE STADIUM

It has become a national obsession to irrationally build expensive stadiums and arenas by politicians working for big business at the peoples' expense. In addition to making the people pay for others to make money on them, they take the peoples' property, hire out of state builders and sometimes leaving the people with the debt after teams leave cities. With all these bombings and now threats of missles attacks, who knows if they will be there long once they are built.

Pittsburgh is a city which is known to be the nation's number one city for losing its people, already has a new stadium (30 years) in same spot (Vey's neighborhood), which was financially mismanaged because the people still owe money on it. Since this new building of a stadium, the politicians are redesigning Pittsburgh, took peoples' property, using workers from out of state. This Court needs to address this issue and prohibit any further building in Pittsburgh.

GRANDPARENTS' RIGHTS TO FAMILY

Another national dilemna is grandparents being denied visitation rights of grandchildren sometimes due to family break-ups, remarriages, a matter needed addressed by this Court.

URINE TESTING

Urine testing is a very illegal act, when it is done against the person's will. Depending on the person's religious beliefs, it violates Search and Seizure, Medical Right to Privacy, Religious Rights, Female's Rights to Body Privacy, Identity Privacy (may need for witness protection), it is humilitating and degrading; another matter for which this Court should address.

TOBACCO FREE ENVIRONMENT

Tobacco smoke is an airborne toxin (nicotene, carbon monoxide), which can kill (heart), injure, and oppress people. Many people like Vey is allergic and has Medical Documentation to prove that it is life-threatening and injurious to her health. If someone wants to injure themselves with tobacco smoke, they do not have the right to kill and injure other with their tobacco and therefore, if it is not outlawed, tobacco should be used only in private with no one else around in the controlled environment; another very urgent matter for which this Court should address, since it means the lives of others.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the petitioner pray that a writ of certiorari be granted for reasons stated above and that the case be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Vey, Pro Se
6-1-99

Appendix 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

EILEEN VEY, TH.D., Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No. 99-496
TOM RIDGE GOVERNOR OF PA, PA Governor, et al, Defendants.	)	

ORDER OF COURT

Before the Court is the complaint and motion for preliminary injunction of the plaintiff, Eileen Vey, TH.D., versus defendants, Tom Ridge, Pa. Governor, et al, wherein the plaintiff, a parolee, requests that the Court order Governor Ridge "Return Parolees (sic) and namely, Eileen Vey, to her original contract in which she was only being seen once a year as model parolee, and no urine as she ahd never taken drugs; Furthermore, the urine tests with parole officers are prohibited."

Moreover, she requests the Court to order the defendant, Governor Tom ridge to cease the building the new stadium in Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, and that the court order the U.S. Attorney to assist her with her case.

The Court has granted the plaintiff's motion to proceeed in forma pauperis. However, the Court shall DISMISS the Complaint and motion for prliminary injunction WITH PREJUDICE pursuant to 28 USC § 1915(d)(2)(B)(i) and (ii) because the complaint is frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

AND NOW, this 31st day of March, 1999, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Complaint and motion for preliminary injunction are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

Donald J. Lee
United States District Judge

cc Eileen Vey, Th.D.
804 Cedar Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15212

(Original 2 pages)

Appendix 2

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 99-3287

Vey

vs.

Ridge

Eileen Vey, Appellant

(Western District of Pennsylvania Civil No. 99-cv-00496)

ORDER

In accordance with the agreement of the parties in the above entitled case, it is entered dismissed by the Clerk under the authority conferred upon him by rule 42(b), Federal rules of appellate Procedure without cost to either party.

P. DOUGLAS SISK

Clerk
U.S. Court of Appeals
for the thrid Circuit

April 20, 1999

cc: Eileen Vey

FILED
JUN 14 1999
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

(2)

****

No. 98-1937

In The
United States Supreme Court
AMERICA

October Term, 1998

EILEEN VEY

V.

Tom Ridge, Governor of PA,
PA Governor, et. al.

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF
Rule 12.4
New to this Case Are The Attached Details Of
The "ILLEGAL CUSTODY" ISSUE
Presented In This New Case Writ

Eileen Vey
804 Cedar Avenue
Pittsburgh PA 15212 U.S.A.
TEL/FAX (412) 322-3131

****

23rd

QUESTION PRESENTED

I.

WILL THE COURT DECLARE EILEEN VEY NOT GUILTY OF 3RD DEGREE HOMOCIDE (AQUITTED OF FIRST DEGREE) FOR REASONS PRESENTED BELOW AND.....

II.

NEW GUN ISSUE PRESENTED

DECLARE VEY NOT GUILTY OF A GUN CHARGE FOR REASON THAT IT IS ***DISCRIMINATION TO CHARGE ONE HOMOCIDE CASE WITH A WEAPON CHARGE AND NOT OTHER HOMOCIDE CASES*** AND BECAUSE IT VIOLATES PERSON'S U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO CARRY A GUN (NOTE: ALL HOMOCIDES REQUIRE A WEAPON, YET NOT ALL ARE WEAPON CHARGED - DISCRIMINATION).

III.

NEW CASE DISCRIMINATION ISSUE

WAS THERE DISCRIMINATION AND CASE FIXING IN THE PA COURT SYSTEM, WHEN THEY DENIED VEY'S "BATTERED WIFE SYDROME" CASE AT ALL LEVELS, BUT GRANTED A QUESTIONABLE "BATTERED GIRLFRIEND" NOT GUILTY VERDICT IN THE STONEHOUSE COP KILLING COP CASE, WHICH ALLEGED SYNDROME WAS PRESENTED "AFTER THE FACT," IE, ON APPEAL.

PARTIES INVOLVED

The United States of America, all goverments of the universe, and "We The People of the Universe!" The Supplemental Petition involve PA Attorney General, Allegheny County D.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBJECT	PAGE
List of Parties	i
Table of Contents	ii
Table of Authorities	iii
Petition for an Extraordinary Writ	1
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	1
U.S. Consitutional Provisions	1
Statement of Case	2
REASON FOR GRANTING WRIT	2
Extreme Prejudice	2
Denied Counsel	3
Prima Facie Habeas Corpus	5
"Reasonable Doubt"	6
CONCLUSION	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITES

AUTHORITY	PAGE
U.S. CONSTITUTION	
Article 1 § 9 (2)	2
ARTICLE VI (2)	1, 2
Amendments 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14	2
FEDERAL CASE LAW	
Alexander v. "American United," Inc	5
Barton v. Eichelberger	5
Batson v. Kentucky	4
Edwards v. Arizona	2
Heck v. Humphrey	3
Harris v. Champion	6
Husbands v. Com of PA	6
Jackson v. Virginia	4
Kirby v. Illinios	5
Merchants & Evans v. Roosevelt Bldg Prod	4
Miller v. Fenton	4
Rogers v. Richmond	5
Thompson v. Baltimore & O.R. Co	5
Truly v. Wanzer	3
U.S. v. Brown	3
U.S. v. rel Fink v. Tod	
FEDERAL STATUTES	
42 USC § 1983	2
28 USC §§ 1651(a), 2241, 2254	1
STATE CASE LAW & STATUTES	
18 PA CSA § 6101(b)	6
Com of PA v. Ruth	7
State v. Haremza	6

No.

In The
United States Supreme Court
AMERICA

October Term, 1998

In re
Eileen Vey

HABEAS CORPUS EXPEDITION REQUESTED

EXTRAORDINARY WRIT

Eileen Vey demands that this Court order PA state to declare her innocence due to "reasonable doubt" in this case of civil rights deprivations of habeas corpus, etc. services.

PREVIOUS ORDERS

As has been noted, all cases ended in denials and, therefore, Vey believes she has been denied due process and has suffered extreme prejudice both here and below.

JURISDICTION

After almost a decade of litigation in federal court, jurisdiction is invoked under 28 §§ 1651(a), 2241, 2254, because she can not obtain relief any other place and, therefore, it is the responsibility of this court to correct the wrongdoing below, **Article VI (2)**.

U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION

Due to "reasonable doubt of sanity" and the"exception clause" of the Pennsylvania Gun Law in this case the

provisions involved are Amendments 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, and Articles I § 9 (2) and VI (2).

STATEMENT OF CASE

Eileen Vey has for long years repeatedly proved "reasonable doubt of sanity" with trial transcripts, affadavits, medical documents, photos, in her state case in which she is still in illegal custody to the state parole.

Reasons For Granting Writ

For long years, the U.S. Court of Appeals (3RD) 1) has entered decisions in conflict with other U.S. Courts of Appeal, even their own (discriminative), 2) so departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, 3) sanctioned such a departure by lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power and 4) decided important federal questions in a way that conflicts with this Court; and this Court has gone against a multitude of its own decisions. LEGAL CHAOS!

EXTREME PREJUDICE

For long years, Vey has requested the federal court system to do its duty, Article VI (2), of declaring her innocent due to "reasonable doubt of sanity" in both habeas corpus writs and civil rights cases. Habeas Corpus relief under civil rights deprivations of the 42 USC § 1983 statute is not new to the U.S. SUPREME COURT, which granted writ of certiorari in **Heck v. Humphrey** (1994) 127 LED 2d 69, a prisoner's § 1983 civil rights case containing a demand for a habeas corpus, as Vey. (See also Appendix)

Somewhere in the court's records, there is a case in which a prisoner had to submit litigation on a piece of toilet paper and he got relief. Also, the courts has always treated pro se cases with understanding, because the person is not a lawyer, yet the Clerk has repeatedly returned Vey's litigation, much of which was appropriate, and the courts has repeatedly denied Vey's "reasonable doubt of sanity" and prima facie" case in both §§ 2254 & 1983 submissions.

Vey has suffered extreme prejudice in the federal court system: a valid case with no lawyer, deprivations of due process, with no lawyer she is forced to testify against her

self, court ruled in Vey's case against own previous rulings, Vey forced to pay while poor (§ 2254), ordered to submit cases as professional lawyers. See Vey's briefing No. 96-3751 (CA3RD). In regards to all cases, she has gross legal evidence of extreme prejudice some of which follows below, 28 USC §§ 47, 144, 455(d), no recusals as law demands:

U.S. ex rel Fink v. Tod (1924) 1 F2d 246 revd on other grounds 267 US 571,

> "Purpose of statutory disqualification is to make certain that the U.S. Court of Appeals consists of Judges uncommitted and uninfluenced by having expressed or formed opinion in court of first instance.."

As stated in **Harris v. Champion** (1994), 15 F3d 1538,

> "Standard under federal recusal statues is an objective one and requires recusal whenever reasonable person, knowing all relevant facts, would harbor doubts about judge's impartiality."

In reference to this case' legal premise under 42 USC § 1983, RICO, and 18 USC § 1346, Vey need show rightful deprivations by respondents, **U.S. v. Brown** (1976) 540 F2d 364: (See also Appendix 1)

> "A deceptive scheme will be violative of this section, if it is shown to operate to deprive individuals of significant intangible rights or interests."

> "For the purposes of this chapter, the term 'scheme or artifice to defraud' includes a scheme or artifice to deprive another of the intangible right of honest services." 18 USC § 1346.

DENIED COUNSEL

Vey was abandoned by counsel on appeal, thereby being forced to illegally testify against herself with 1984 confused data of a time she was suffering PTSD from beatings and other abuse, nightmares, all of which was confused with 1984 reality. This envokes violations of Amendment 1 (right to petition judicial government for redress of grievance, Amendment 5 (testify against self), Amendment 6 (right to counsel), Amendment 14 (due process),

Amendment 2 (right to bear arms), Amendment 14 "equal protection" of PA state gun law "exception clause" and homocide defenses.

Furthermore, in **Edwards v. Arizona** (1991), 451 U.S. 477, **this Court** has held that once a suspect invokes his Fifth Amendment right to counsel, not only must the interrogation cease, but the police cannot reinterrogate or otherwise initiate contact designed to produce incriminating statements..

Vey was abandoned by counsel and forced for years, against her will, to litigate a traumatic valid state case in which "reasonable doubt" of sanity was produced.

Furthermore, **this Court** has held in **Rogers v. Richmond** (1961) 365 U.S. 534 that subjecting a defendant to pressures that violate our accusatorial system **offends the due process of law clause which the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees**.

Furthermore, **this Court** in the case of **Miller v. Fenton** (1985) 474 U.S. 104 has ruled accordingly:

> "Certain interrogation techniques, either in isolation or as applied to the unique characteristics of a particular suspect, are **so offensive to a civilized system of justice that they must be condemned**."

Furthermore, **this Court** also has held that under the Fifth Amendment provision against self-incrimination, an accused has right to counsel during in-custody (Vey in custody to parole) interrogations prior to the initiation of adversary proceedings, **Kirby v. Illinois** (1972), 405 U.S. 682, 689.

Under 42 USC § 1983, Vey need show rightful deprivations by respondents:

> "Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, or any State or Territory of the District of Columbia, subjects, or caused to subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in any action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.."

Alexander v. "American United," Inc. 416 U.S. 745:

> "Irreparable injury is the essential prerequisit for injunctive relief."

Truly v. Wanzer, 12 LEd 88:

> "To obtain an injunction, the right must be clear, the injury impending and threatened so as to averted only by the protecting preventive process of injunction."

The Third Circuit deprived Vey of her right to their own rulings in which they ruled against TWO of their recent cases at time she presented her brief for medical injunction (discrimination). **Barton v. Eichelberger** (CA3RD 1970) 451 F2d 263 and **Merchant & Evans v. Roosevelt Building Products** (CA3RD 1992), 963 F2d 628, 632.

PRIMA FACIE HABEAS CORPUS

In reference to Vey's Prima Facie Habeas Corpus of long years submissions, THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT has ruled in the applicable case of **Batson v. Kentucky**, 476 U.S. 79:

> "person claiming to have been a victim of intentional discrimination (employment may make out a prima facie case) by relying solely on the facts concerning the alleged discrimination against him."

THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT also has ruled in an applicable case concerning Vey's SEEKING PRIMA FACIE HABEAS CORPUS RELIEF (i.e., her voluminous evidence attached in previous submissions, trial transcripts, photo, medical documents, affadavits), **Thompson v. Baltimore & O.R. Co.** (1945) 59 FS 767, cert denied 329 U.S. 762, 91 LEd 657:

> "investing the federal courts with power to declare the rights of any interested party seeking the declaration must plead and prove the facts which entitle him to relief, inasmuch as he is affirmatively seeking a judgment to establish his rights."

Courts use the concept of "prima facie" case in two senses: (1) in sense of plaintiff producing evidence sufficient to render reasonable a conclusion in favor of allegation she asserts; and (2) in sense that, not only the plaintiff's evidence would reasonably allow conclusion plaintiff seeks,

but also that plaintiff's evidence compels such a conclusion, if the defendants produce no evidence to rebut it, **Husbands v. Com of PA**, D.C. of PA , 395 FS 1107, 1139.

Prima Facie Evidence is evidence good and sufficient on its face and such evidence which, in the judgment of the law, is sufficient to establish a given fact. Moreover, prima facie evidence is evidence which, if unexplained or uncontradicted, is sufficient to **sustain a judgment in favor of the issue which it supports**. **State v. Haremza**, 213 Kan. 201, 512 P.2d 1217, 1222.

'REASONABLE DOUBT"

What is the "reasonable doubt" of which Vey demands that **this Court** declare her innocence and, therefore, command Pennsylvania to clear her of all charges immediately? REASONABLE DOUBT OF SANITY OR CONSCIOUSNESS (responsibility)!!

Vey has for long tiring years has supported her claims of "illegal custody" and "kidnapped under color of state" with exceptional voluminous evidence in the courts and, not only have new evidence to this particular case, but **new evidence to the court**. That evidence is the confidential file of the late Pittsburgh City Councilman and attorney, Robert Rade Stone, which file states that when he saw Eileen Vey in jail after her arrest, she stated to him that she did not remember anything. This verifies the BLACKOUT, showing lack of responsibility, "reasonable doubt!"

The repeated evidence is 1) Vey's own declaration of "illegal custody," "kidnapped under color of state," which meets the unrebuted prima facie evidence law, 2) trial records of supporting evidence, 3) medical records of beatings, 4) Press photo of bag lying next to deceased (weapons known to be carried by him, according to trial record testimony, were allegedly not found on or in his bag of deceased (evidence tampering), 5) marriage licence copy proving married by PA Common Pleas Judge, Vey crime detection of Heinz murder (possible case tampering: note Vey was abandoned by Federal Public Defender, Thomas W. White and PA state appointed attorney Lynn McBeth, and her PCRA was in the Court of Common Pleas 4 years!), 6) PA gun law "exception clause" 18 PA CSA § 6101 (b), trial testimony and Vey's statement of nomadic life in station wagon (deceased running from prosecution) and, therefore,

met the exception rule. The trial records of overwelming evidence of "reasonable doubt" were statements of witnesses stating 7) Vey cried for "help," 8) suffering the "battered wife syndrome," and bi-polar condition at the time of the torturous life (psychiatrist), the gun being fired **without bullets** (detective), right from wrong issue, 9) Vey complained of head hurting and detective gave head ache medicine (possible head injury), but did not let her see medical doctor (detective statement) and now the **new evidence** of 10) the file report stating Vey had no memory of the tragedy by the late attorney Robert Rade Stone, evidence Vey never submitted previously (unavailable).

Vey again has proved "reasonable doubt" of the 3RD Homocide (acquitted of 1ST) charge and the PA Gun charge: life-style was that of a transient, nomad, wagon was home, which situation warrants the "exception clause."

Therefore, because there is no "proof of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt," the rule of **Jackson v. Virginia**, 443 US 307 (1979), at 324, (reh dn 444 US 307) is grossly applicable to Vey's case.

> "The applicant is entitled to habeas corpus relief if it is found that upon the record evidence adduced at trial no rational trier of fact could have found proof of guilt beyond a "reasonable doubt."

Furthermore, given the traumatic conditions under which Vey was subjected, she requests that this Court additionally consider the applicability of the Doctrine of Culpability, a situation in which a man cannot be held punishable should his life or liberty be in jeopardy, when he is confronted with overwhelming pressure and makes a choice between two evils. (Also see **Com v. Ruth**)

CONCLUSION

THEREFORE, the petitioner, Eileen Vey, hereby demands that this Court declare her innocent and order PA state to vacate judgment and clear the record of both charges.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Vey, Pro Se

Appendix 1

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
Western District

COM OF PENNSYLVANIA	:	
	:	No. 57
v.	:	W.D. Misc. Dkt. 1996
EILEEN VEY,	:	
Petitioner	:	

ORDER

PER CURIAM:

AND NOW, this 20th day of June, 1996, the Petition for Review is denied.

Appendix 2

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 91-3021

EILEEN VEY, 007617
v.
WILLIAM WOLFE

Eileen Vey,
Appellant

On Appeal From the U.S. District Court
For the W.D. of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civil Action No. 90-00035)
District Judge: Honorable Barron P. McCune

Submitted Pursuant to Third Circuit Rule 12(6)
September 3, 1991

BEFORE: STAPLETON, GREENBERG, and ALIDSERT,
Circuit Judges

(Opinion Filed Nov 13 1991)

RECEIVED
NOV 16 1991
FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER
W.D. OF PENNSYLVANIA
(THOMAS W. WHITE)

CLIENT'S COPY

OPINION OF THE COURT

PER CURIAM:

Petitioner Eileen Vey is a prisoner at the State Correction Institution in Muncy, Pennsylvania. Following a bench trial in the Court of Common Pleas for Allegheny County in 1985, she was convicted of third degree murder and unlawful firearms possession and was sentenced to serve seven to eighteen years imprisonment. The Superior Court affirmed the judgment of sentence, and thereafter the Pennsylvania Supreme Court declined to hear Vey's appeal.[1] In September, 1988, Vey filed a petition pursuant to Pennsylvania's Post Conviction Relief Act (PCHA). After an evidentiary hearing, the petition was denied in August, 1989. Several weeks later, petitioner's counsel filed a notice of appeal from the denial of this petition.

Also in September, 1989, Vey filed her first petition for writ of habeas corpus in the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. Soon thereafter,

---

1. Vey raised four issues before both the Superior Court and the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in her direct appeal: (1) Whether the trial court erred in failing to suppress two statements taken in violation of Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966); (2) whether the trial court erred when it refused vey's request to introduce evidence of the victim's past criminal record; (3) whether the trial court erred in failing to grant a new trial due to the verdict being against the weight of the evidence; and (4) whether it was unconstitutional for the trial court to require Vey to prove her own insanity.

petitioner filed a pro se notice of withdrawal of her state PCRA appeal, stating that she wished to pursue her claims in federal court. Prior to receiving formal notice of this withdrawal, the federal district court dismissed the habeas petition for failure to exhaust state remedies. This court subsequently denied Vey's request for a certificate of probable cause.

Vey filed the instant, second petition for writ of habeas corpus on January 9, 1990. This petition originally raised three claims; as amended, the petition raises seven claims.2 The magistrate recommended that the petition be denied because petitioner had deliberately bypassed available state court remedies. By memorandum order entered January 4, 1991, the district court (McCune, J.) adopted the magistrate's report and recommendation, denied the habeas petition and found no probable cause for appeal.

Vey filed a notice of appeal, and this Court granted a certificate of probable cause on April 11, 1991. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2253 and 1291.

---

2. The seven claims raised in the instant petition are as follows: (1) the verdict was against the weight of the evidence; (2) the PCRA judge acted under a conflict of interests; (3) counsel at trial rendered ineffective assistance; (4) exculpatory evidence regarding petitioner's mental health was ignored; (5) denial of a fair trial due to admission of perjured testimony; (6) statements were obtained and admitted at trial in violation of Miranda; and (7) there was exculpatory evidence at trial showing petitioner's failure to distinguish right from wrong. All these claims had been raised in Vey's PCRA petition.

About a valid excuse, a peitioner must fairly present all federal claims to the highests state court before they may be reviewed by a federal court on a habeas petition. 28 USC § 2254(b); Rose v. Lundy, 455 U.S. 509 (1982). In some cases, however, the petitioner is unable to present claims to the highest state court due to a procedural bar. In this case, for example, Vey withdrew her PCRA appeal before reaching the Pennsylvania Supreme Court; as a result, she may not again raise these claims in state court. Commonwealth v. Shaffer, 569 A.2d 360, 363-64 (Pa. Super. 1990), appeal denied, 577 A.2d 889 (pa. 1990).

In Coleman v. Thompson, ___U.S.___, 111 S.Ct. 2546 (1991), the United States Supreme Court recently held that where a state prisoner's federal claims are barred in state court because of a default on her part, and the prisoner is thus prevented from presenting her claims to the highest state court, habeas review of the claims in the federal system is barred unless the prisoner can demonstrate cause for the default and actual prejudice as a result of the alleged violation of federal law. The Court did not base its decision on the principle of exhaustion, but rather on the independent and adequate state ground doctine: that is, where a prisoner has defaulted her federal claims in state court, her custody is supported by the procedural bar itself. If a federal court were to require a new trial for a prisoner in these circumstances, it would render ineffective the state procedural rule. Id., 11 S. Ct. at 2554.

Vey argues that the withdrawal of her PCRA appeal was a mistake, taken without the advice of counsel, and suggests that this error is sufficient cause for her default. The Court in Coleman, however, made clear that the petitioner bears the risk of procedural errors made in state proceedings. Indeed, the Court stressed that only constitutionally ineffective assistance of counsel constitutes cause; otherwise, the State bears no responsibility for the default. Id. at 2566-67; See also Murray v. Carrier, 477 U.S. 478, 488 (1986) (responsibility for errors of constitutionally ineffective counsel imputed to the State through Sixth Amendment). Because petitioner enjoys no constitutional right to counsel in post-conviction proceedings, Vey's decision to withdraw from collateral state review is therefore not cause for her default. Coleman, 111 S.Ct. at 256-67. This is true even though Vey apparently withdrew

her PCRA appeal with the intention of getting to federal court as soon as possible. It follows that Vey could not advance before the district court the seven challenges to her conviction contained in her PCRA petition.

This does not end our jurisdiction inquiry, however. Before commencing collateral review, Vey appealed her conviction directly to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. It is well settled that a petitioner need not appeal issues through the state courts more than once in order to exhaust her claims. Castille v. Peoples, 4889 U.S. 346, 340-51 (1989) (where petitioner has fairly presented claim to state courts through direct appeal,subsequent collateral review not necessary for exhaustion); Brown v. Allen, 344 U.S. 443, 447-50 (1953)("[i]t is not necessary...for the prisoner to ask the state for collateral relief, based on the same evidence and issues already decided by direct implicate the independent and adequate state ground doctrine, because the procedural default occurring on collateral review did not prevent the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania from facing these issues once. Finally, inclusion of claims that are procedurally barred does not render this a "mixed petition" of exhausted and unexhausted claims whidh must be dismissed in its entirety under Rose v. Lundy, 455 U.S. 509 (1982). All the claims raised by Vey in the instant petition are exhausted because state remedies are no longer available with respect to any of them. Engle v. Isaac, 456 U.S. 107, 125-26 n. 28 (1982); See also Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288, 298 (1989) (where collateral relief is unavailable due to procedural bar, state remedies have been "exhausted" with respect to that claim). Further state review of the barred claims is no longer possible; application of the Rose rule here would have the effect of forever excluding truly exhausted claims from federal haeas review.

It follows that the district court should have considered claims presented in the petition which had previously been considered on direct appeal. Two issues have thus been preserved: (1) whether the trial court erred in failing to oppress two statements made by Vey taken in violation of Miranda, and (2) whether the trial court erred in failing to rant a new trial when the verdict was against the weight of the evidence.

We will reverse the judgment of the district court and remand for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

TO THE CLERK

Please file the foregoing Per Curiam Opinion.

By the Court,

Circuit Judge

ROBERT RADE STONE, ESQUIRE

W O R K S H E E T

Pft_____ Dft_____ Date:_____ File#_____

CLIENT: MUSHINSKY, EILEEN

Address:_____

_____

Phone:_____Bus:_____

Born:_____Guardian:_____

_____

Marital Status:_____Spouse:_____

INS: Med Pay:_____Hosp:_____
Property:____

NAME:_____

_____

Address:_____

_____

Phone:_____Bus

Ins. Co._____

_____

Claim No:_____

(1)

Appendix 3
(Four Pages)

Please turn booklet sideways to view copy of original record divided into next four (4) pages.

Co:_____ _____Phone:_____
Adj:_____
Claim No:_____ Atty:_____Phone:_____

FEE: Flat:_____Time:_____ Address:_____
Cont:_____Amount:_____
Rate:_____ _____

KIND OF CASE:_____D/A:_____S/L:_____

HEARING DATE:_____ Referred by:_____

(2)

DATE	SERVICE OR REMARKS	TIME	CHARGE	ATTY
6/13/84	T/C FROM Ann Hawk. Allegedly Eileen Mushinsky shot 2nd husband on the bridge. Allegedly she married him 12/22/83 and he's a man with 11 children. I'm to check this out.	.3		RRS:pgn
6/15/84	T/C, COLLECT, from Eileen Mushinsky from County Jail. Request we visit Monday. Request advise.	.3		RRS:pgn

5/18/84	WENT, PER REQUEST, to : Mushinsky Vey in re: advise. She claims no memory of events. Could not advise. Recommended she get an attorney.	1.0		RRS:pgn
7/30/84	T/C FROM Mrs. Vey in re: conference tonight. Set it up at 9 p.m.	.3		RRS:pgn
7/30/84	CONFERENCE WITH Mrs. Vey. After getting the facts, I recommended she get an attorney immediately. The matter is very serious and too much time is passing without preparation.	.5		RRS:pgn

(4)

DATE	SERVICE OR REMARKS	TIME	CHARGE	ATTY
8/15/84	DIRECTED ASSOCIATE to call Lester Nauhaus at Public Defender's Office in re: complaint of service on her homicide case.	.3		RRS:pgn
10/19/84	RECEIVED CALL FROM Client and since RRS was tied up, she wanted to inform me that the Judge got a private attorney, (Peter Dickson) to represent her in this case and she was grateful for what office did in matter.	.2		RJF:js
12/19/84	----------CLOSED----------			RRScjd

I, L. Martin Wekselman

hereby certify that on the 22 day of December one thousand nine hundred and 33 at Pittsburgh

Eugene C. Vey and Eileen Muslinsky

Were, by me

United in Marriage,

in accordance with license issued by the Clerk of the Orphans' Court Division of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania,

Numbered 57632 Series TWO-C Signed L. Martin Wekselman

Title Judge Court of Common Pleas

ORIGINAL

Appendix 4
(Two Pages)

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA } ss.
COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY

No. 57632 Series TWO-C

To any Person Authorized by Law to Solemnize Marriage:

You are hereby authorized to join together, in the holy state of matrimony, according to the Laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,

Eugene C. Vey, of full age and ~~never~~ once heretofore married, and

Div. January 11, 1983

Eileen T Wasbynsky, likewise of full age and ~~never~~ twice heretofore married.

Div. 10-1967 Div. February 10, 1921.

Given under my hand and seal of the Orphans' Court Division of the Court of Common Pleas of the County of Allegheny, at Pittsburgh, this 19th day of December Anno Domini one thousand nine hundred and Eighty-Three.

Rita Wilson Kane Clerk

THIS LICENSE MUST BE USED WITHIN 60 DAYS FROM DATE OF ISSUE

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 21 1999
CLERK

☆☆☆

QUESTION PRESENTED

I.

WILL VEY'S CASE RESTORE LAW AND ORDER AND INITIATE ONE HARMONIC LAW SYSTEM TO THE UNIVERSE.

PARTIES INVOLVED

"We The People of the Universe," everyone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBJECT	PAGE
Parties Involved	i
Table of Contents	ii
Petition for Writ	1
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	1
U.S. Constitutional Provision	2
Statement of 11-Year Case	2
REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT	2
CONCLUSION	5

☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

No. 98-1937

In The

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

AMERICA

October Term, 1998

VEY V. Ridge

Also **Vey v. Universe, U.S.A. et al**

2ND SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

Writ of Certiorari (3RD Circuit)

Rule 12.4

CASE NAME CHANGE REQUESTED

☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

The petitioner, Eileen Vey ("Vey"), hereby demands the granting of this Writ of Certiorari in her Universal Rescue Mission: Restoration of Law and Order, Justice and her establishing a UNIVERSAL ONE LAW SYSTEM.

OPINIONS BELOW

Vey's 15-year valid case compilation involving multiple U.S. and universal jurisdictions, now adds **Vey v. Universe, U.S.A. et al** DCWD of PA No. 99-911 presently being denied expedition.

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction (2ND Supplemental Brief) is envoked by Rules 12.4 & 15.8, because these multiple worldwide complaint lists are all the same and closely related to **this case, a minute portion** of her list: LAWLESSNESS, URGENCY FOR RESTORATION OF LAW AND ORDER AND A ONE UNIVERSAL LAW SYSTEM.

Federal law makes provision, Castille v. Peoples, 489 U.S. 346, 340-51 (1989 state case) to bypass lower courts, where district court continues disorderliness: expedition (Appendix 1).

U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Interplanetary Law, International Law, inclusive of Diplomatic Immunity, the entire United States Constitution and its Universal upholding against conflicting lower law is the responsibility of this Court under its Linchpin, ARTICLE VI (2), Federal Supremacy Clause in these anarchial times! All laws written or unwritten which conflict iwth the U.S. CONSTITUTION.

STATEMENT OF CASE

Vey's 15-year tag-a-long universal cases compilation in the federal court system for eleven (11) years include prima facie habeas corpi, civil rights, RICO, pleas to RESTORE LAW & ORDER , pleas for Justice prosecution of peoples' cases left dormant, many Wake-up Calls, and other matters. Statute of limitation for most these cases have not expired due to the RICO Rule and Federal Case Law, Central... v. Slotky (1992) 956 F2d 1369 (7TH) and Rodriguez v. Holmes (1992) 963 F2d 799, 805 (5TH), because Vey has been litigating her habeas corpus all these years.

Moreover, Vey's RESCUE MISSION case (possibly submitted more than seven times) has become a Universal Wake-up Call for ONE UNIVERSAL LAW SYSTEM and RESTORATION OF LAW & ORDER , due to the sedition, anarchy, and treasonous acts here in the United States and abroad, as well as the chaotic conflicting laws worldwide.

REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT

Very briefly, , writ of certiorari should be granted, because lower courts has so departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings and sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power and for reasons that important extraordinary federal questions involved herein should be settled by this Court and that relief can be found nowhere in the world.

Vey's Intergalactic Rescue Mission
7TH WAKE-UP CALL

INTERGALACTIC URGENCIES

For reasons of Intergalactic Urgencies and others listed here, this Court should not only grant the Writ, but cancel summer recess in order to decide these urgent matters.

The reason for the urgent need of a ONE UNIVERSAL LAW SYSTEM is due to the urgencies and that everything we do is relevant to the entire universe these days, as Vey has submitted previously here, that is, we travel, communicate, trade, the air we breath, etc. is all effected universally.

Some of these intergalactic urgencies challenging us for the immediate need of laws and enforcement are: eco-system relevancy to human existance, comminications linked with outer space satelites, space travel and trade, debri in space, space equipment brakedowns, space scams, meteors observance, nuclear testing airborn health and weather hazards, dangerous computer hacking, hostile sabatoge of national security weapons creating disasters, illegal spying private information in criminal hands, et cetera.

INTERNATIONAL URGENCIES

Furthermore, we have an urgent need for a one law system and its law enforcement thereof for reasons of international matters, some of which are: old nuclear plants meltdowns causing dangerous blackouts, conditions of the world's major dams and bridges (blackouts, floods); control of hazardous biological/chemical/hi-technological weapons, that can be purchased and dropped from planes, airborn offshore toward land by boats, planted in air systems, used upwind of anyone or group; transportation safety of vehicles such as planes, parts falling from them, riotous drunks, commercial plane routes over populous areas, disease control in all aspects, oil tankers safety, ferries, cruise ships; private and corporate workers with national security information and technological access; prohibition of private information; dismembered and disabled needs going unmet, sports matters, humane treatment of animals; newsmedia's crimes; one currency system, banking; farmland 7th

year rest to restore minerals and vitamins to our foods again; cults; ghoulish corporate medical business (chemical/biological/technological/ murder schemes to obtain blackmarket body parts, cloning, Medical Doctors as hitmen for assassin purposes, etc. Vey's experience with Health Care business problems extends to the states of CA, LA, VA, OH, NY, ILL, MD, PA, LA, TX, MN, CO, MA involving internationals.

*Leaders should submit their belief of whether our U.S. Constitutional Form of Government ENFORCED (not what they see in practice today) should be that one universal law system or which? Briefs in these matters can be submitted under Rule 37.2.

CLEAN-UP IN U.S. URGENCIES

SEDITIOUS STATUS OF U.S.

The urgent need for this Writ's granting concerns: Treason by leaders, Anarchy, Sedition, our government operating against our U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL FORM OF GOVERNMENT; Diplomatic Immunity outlawed, mob-type politicians infiltrating our government system; unprosecuted crimes of leaders, the rich and powerful, and others (prejudicial justice system), numerous national security risks of information with ex-CIA , MILITARY, FBI, etc. illegal prosecutions for political purposes in America, cheap counterfeits stealing/plagerizing Vey's 11-year ideas from her litigation and parading them in public (Federal Violation!). Vey has been fighting to restore LAW & ORDER, U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL FORM OF GOVERNMENT since 1991. See **Vey v. PA Governor Casey** (1991), the unprosecuted case of late U.S. Senator, 18 USC § 32; biological/chemical/technological hazards control; polution control as a whole; need to outlaw tobacco (deadly toxic killing nicotine), dangerous cults....

CRIMES IN U.S.

Vey's crime lists include those stated above, the illegal operation of the White House and U.S. Department of Justice, etc., in violation of the RICO, Civil Rights, Laws, etc.The illegal operation of , notonly federal, but also state governments. Vey will prove the illegalities of carpetbagging career politicians state jumping for key positions for government control for possibly mafias, communists, who, if they have to do it dishonestlly this way?

SOME METHODS/MEANS OF CLEAN-UP IN U.S.

After Vey proves the above crimes to the Court, Vey wants Bench Warrants, charge of the U.S. Military and U.S. Department of Justice so she can make the arrests of the criminals; we need fill-ins for those arrested, need Order for all police and Military to unite as one force (locals have no money for their police anymore). See previous Writs presented here in U.S. SUPREME COURT by Vey, a request to reopen those cases or Writs previously presented here, et cetera.

RELIEF NO WHERE BUT THIS COURT

In past fifteen (15) years state and eleven (11) years in federal courts proves 1) extreme prejudice below, 2) no relief in any government, 3) no relief from the International Court of Justice, and 4) United Nations, where Turner's $1 billion dollars looks like bribes, fixing, intimidation, discrimination, etc., 5) Vey wrote others relentlessly: no relief, 6) no medical relief all these years for Vey, 7) no prima facie habeas corpus in which discrimination of state "Battered Wife Syndrome," etc. laws were denied her all these years, 8) no F.B.I. or government protection offered Vey or relatives for a possible retaliations against activist Vey, 9) See Appendix proof of discrimination of more "reasonable doubt" by Federal Judge Lee's statement using the word "dilusional," whether true of false at No. 94-2141, page two.

Vey requests this case name be changed to the attached U.S. District Court (WD of PA) caption, because of this case universal jurisdiction and as stated above, state case is only a minute portion of the colossal universal jurisdictional list of Vey's.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, grant the Writ of Certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Vey, Pro Se

Appendix 1

In The United States District Court
For The Western District of Pennsylvania

EILEEN VEY, Plaintiff v.	:	
The Universe (Governments & All Those Involved In Outerspace & Skies), U.S.A., (The Executive, Senate, Judicial Branches, Inclusive of All Federal, State, County, Local Governments), All World Governments, The International Court of Justice, The United Nations, Et Al., Defendants.	:	No. 99-911

COMPLAINT

This is a multidistrict jurisdiction case in which the Plaintiff, Eileen Vey ("Vey") has a colossal complaint list of 15 years (state & local), 11 (federal), and approximately 2 years (worldwide or universally) hand has not received relief anywhere.

1. Vey can not receive medical attention anywhere, as she continously goes to hospitals everywhere in The U.S.A. and has seen Medical Doctors from all over the World. Injured, reinjured with no attention, namely Freddy Fu, M.D. for about seven (7) years.

2. Vey can not receive legal attention, as she continuously goes to courts practically everywhere in the U.S.A., The United Nations, and World Court (See Attached).

3. Vey can not complete her mission of Universal Crime Clean-up, Law & Order, Restoration, et cetera.

4. Vey can not complete her mission of a harmonious World and Universal Order, with a Universal One Law System, because she has not appropriate access for all these long years.

The list goes on and on, but what is the use of writing another list as previously, if she is denied access or relief again here? So, the Plaintiff Vey motions Court to grant IFP in district court and appellate courts above and expedite case in this last attempt for relief. Moreover, will the Court kindly tell Vey if the U.S. Solicitor General is enough to serve case at this time?

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction is envoked under 28 §§ 1330 and 1331.

Vey seeks in excess of $50,000 and the above mentioned and previous 11-year requests, although the World does not have enough money to pay her for abandoning her with no country all these years. Jury trial demanded.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Vey, Pro Se 5-30-99

CC: U.S. SOLICITOR GENERAL (CERTIFIED: CERTIFIED ATTACHED)

Appendix 2

AMENDED APS-127 February 13, 1997

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS (3RD)

C.A. No. 96-3571

EILEEN VEY

vs.

PRESIDENT & FIRST LADY CLINTON, ET AL.

(W.D. Pa. Civ. No. 94-cv-2141)

Present: BECKER, ALITO, AND MCKEE, CIRCUIT JUDGE

Submitted are:

(1) By the Clerk for possible dismissal pursuant to 28 USC § 1915 (e)(2); and

(2) Appellant's motion for withdrawal of appeal, filed February 19, 1997

in the above-captioned case.

Respectfully,

Clerk

PDS/NBS/ms

ORDER

The appeal is herby dismissed pursuant to 28 USC § 1915(e)(2)(i) (1996), because it is legally frivolous. The Appellant's motion to withdraw this appeal is denied as moot.

By the Court,

BECKER

Dated: FEB 27 1997 Circuit Judge

Appendix 3

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

EILEEN VEY, Plaintiff, vs. PRESIDENT & FIRST LADY CLINTON, CHINA PREMIER LI PENG, U.S. SENATOR BOB DOLE, U.S. SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER, U.S. SENATOR JESSIE HELMS U.S. SENATOR WOFFORD, U.S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICE REHNQUIST, , REN JIANXIN, CHINA SUPREME PEOPLE S COURT, D. SLOVITER, CHIEF JUDGE, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS (3RD), J. RENO, U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL, LOUIS FREEH, F.B.I. DIRECTOR, ROBERT P. CASEY, PA GOVERNOR, M. SINGEL, PA LT. GOVERNOR, PA GOVERNOR ELECT RIDGE, M. SCHWEIKER, PA LT GOV ELECT, PA ATTORNEY GEN PRATE, C.J. NIX, FR., PA SUPERIOR COURT, CH J ROWLEY, ROBERT COLVILLE, ALL CO D.A., TOM FORESTER, CHRMN ALL CO COMMISS, PITTSBURGH MAYOR TOM MURPHY, AMA PRES JOS. T. PAINTER, ABA PRES R. WLM IDE, III, ACLJ PRES JAY SEKULOW, ACLU PRES NADINE STROSSEN, AMTRAK PRESIDENT, LAIDLAW TRANSIT INTERNATIONAL, NATIONAL (OWENS) PRESIDENT, GREYHOUND BUS PRESIDENT, AND ADM JDG SSI PACE, ET AL, Defendants.	)	CIVIL ACTION No. 94-2141

This is another in a series of pro se forma pauperis actions intitiated by the plaintiff, Eileen Vey.

The defendants include, inter alia, President and First Lady Clinton, China Premier Le Peng, various U.S. Senators, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Rehnquist, China Supreme Peoples's Court Pres. Judge Ren Jianxin, U.S. Court of Appeals Chief Judge Sloviter of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, U.S. Attorney Janet Reno and FBI Director Louis Freeh, as well as other state and local officials, President of Amtrak, President of Greyhound Bus and others.

The paintiff seeks the following relief and/or damages:
Immediate MEDICAL RELIEF, prima facie § 2254 HABEAS CORPUS GRANTED, expert Orthopedic surgeon, Dr. Freddy Fu, SSI from 1992 granted, all the above corrected, payment for crime detection, money for damages in excess of $50,000 (a Billion could not cover sufferings) lawyer Jerry Spence for all Vey's cases, appropriate hospitalization until Vey walks, other medical needs corrected, etsc...)

The plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis has been granted and this action will be dismissed as being absolutely frivolous, 28 USC §§ 1915(a) and 1915(b). See Neitzke v. Williams, 490 US 319, 327 (1989) (complaint is frivolous, where based on fanciful delusional factual scenario); roman v. Jeffes, 904 F2d 192, 194 n. 1 (3d Cir. 1990); Driebelbis v. Marks, 675 F2d 579, 580 (3d Cir. 1982) (collecting cases).

NOW, THEREFORE, this 15th day of December 1994, it is hereby ORDERED that plaintiff's complaint is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDIC.**

Donald J. Lee
U.S. District Judge

cc: Ms. Eileen Vey
804 Cedar Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15212

Appendix 4

Case No: 98-3875

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

ORDER

EILEEN VEY
Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

DAVID OTTO, et al.
Defendants-Appellees

FILED
AUG 31 1998
LEONARD GREEN, Clerk

Appellant having previousy been advised that failure to satisfy certain specified obligations would result in dismissal of the case for want of prosecution and it appearing that the appellant has failed to satisfy the following obligation(s):

The proper fee was not paid by 8/26/98.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that this court be, and it hereby is, dismissed for want of prosecution.

ENTERED PURSUANT TO RULE 8(b),
RULES OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

Leonard Green, Clerk

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUL 15 1999
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

☆☆☆

PARTIES INVOLVED

"We The People of the Universe," everyone.

QUESTION PRESENTED

I.

AGAIN, WILL EILEEN VEY'S ("VEY") CASE RESTORE LAW AND ORDER TO HER COUNTRY AND ESTABLISHING ONE HARMONIC LAW SYSTEM TO THE UNIVERSE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBJECT	PAGE
Parties Involved	i
Table of Contents	ii
Petition for Writ	1
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	1
U.S. Constitutional Provision	2
Statement of 11-Year Case	2
REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT	2
CONCLUSION	5

☆☆

No. 98-1937
In The
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
AMERICA

October Term, 1998

VEY v. The Universe, U.S.A., et al.

(*Also, VEY v. PA Governor, et al)

3RD SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF
Writ of Certiorari (3RD Circuit)
Rule 11
Mandamus/Prohibition Case
Case Name Change Requested

☆☆

The petitoner, Eileen Vey ("Vey"), hereby demands the granting of this Writ of Certiorari in her Universal Rescue Mission: Restoration of Law and Order and her establishing a UNIVERSAL ONE LAW SYSTEM.

OPINIONS BELOW

On June 25, 1999, the U.S. District Court (WD of PA) denied the case **Vey v. The Universe, U.S.A., et al**, No. 99-911 (Appendix 1). On June 28, 1999, Vey appealed the case to the U.S. Court of Appeals (3RD), now docketed at No. 99-3532, where it is pending.

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction is envoked under Rules 11 and 12.4, in that a pending case of public importance (universal jurisdiction) can be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court and that multiple writs of same matters (justice, law & order, etc) together can be appealed.

U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Interplanetary Law, International Law, inclusive of Diplomatic Immunity, the entire United States Constitution and its Universal upholding against conflicting acts and lower laws is the responsibility of this Court under its Linchpin, ARTICLE VI (2), Federal Supremacy Clause and **Marburger v. Madison, Ginsburg v. U.S** in these anarchial times! Moreover, it includes all laws written or unwritten which conflict with the U.S. CONSTITUTION RE: Mandamus/Prohibition.

STATEMENT OF CASE

This complaint was filed and docketed, **Vey v. The Universe**, et al., No. 99-911, in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania on June 11, 1999, was denied on June 25, 1999 (Appendix 1). On June 28, 1999 Vey appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (3RD), where it is pending at No. 99-3532 (Appendix 2).

REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT

Very briefly, writ of certiorari should be granted, because lower courts has so departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings and sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power and for reasons that important extraordinary federal questions involved herein should be settled by this Court and that relief can be found nowhere in the world or universe!

NO RELIEF ANYWHERE!

The eleven years of no relief proves the 1) extreme prejudice below and most issues were submitted repeatedly, 2) no relief from all other branches of government these years which proves its illegal operations, 3) no relief from the International Court of Justice, and 4) the $1 billion dollars received from Turner by the United Nations makes Vey believe it can be fixed. Vey has been writing everyone relentlessly for all these years, suffering no relief, legally, medically, judicially, politically....

ANOTHER WAKE-UP CALL!

Vey submitted many Wake-up Calls, some of which were those special writs docketed here are Numbers 96-6050, 96-8796, 98-17, and 98-1088.

The United States of America has become the laughingstock of the nations: bullying other nations under guise of righteousness for profit (attempts to steal Saddam's oil according to Veteran groups), forcing alleged "righteous ways" on other nations against our own U.S. Constitutional Form of Government, while leaders are committing crimes themselves, while the United States is in a state of anarchy, sedition and treasonous acts by leaders. Leader sympathizing with communism (used communist money to gain U.S. Presidency take-over), while China's Jeng Zemin reportedly stated that he will not adopt our form of government. Is that the form he sees in practice or that U.S. Constitutional Form of Government not being upheld here, or was it his firm commitment to communism? (SEE Appendix!)

INTERGALACTIC URGENCIES

For reasons of Intergalactic Urgencies and others listed here, this Court should not only grant the Writ, but cancel summer recess in order to decide these urgent matters.

The reason for the urgent need of a ONE UNIVERSAL LAW SYSTEM is due to the urgencies and that everything we do is relevant to the entire universe these days, as Vey has submitted previously here, that is, we travel, communicate, trade, the air we breath, et cetera, is all effected universally.

Some of these intergalactic urgencies challenging us for the immediate need of laws and enforcement are: eco-system relevancy to human existance, comminications linked with outer space satelites, space travel and trade, debri in space, space equipment breakdowns, space scams, meteors observance, nuclear testing airborn health and weather hazards, dangerous computer hacking, hostile sabatoge of national security weapons creating disasters, illegal spying of private information in criminal hands, use of airwaves all done through satelites? Also, nuclear, bio/chem/technological warfare and its affects in outerspace and world should be considered, while writing appropriate laws for these late times, AND WE ARE LATE IN THESE MATTERS!

INTERNATIONAL URGENCIES

Furthermore, we have an urgent need for a one law system and its law enforcement thereof for reasons of international matters, some of which are: old nuclear plants meltdowns causing dangerous blackouts, conditions of the world's major dams and bridges (blackouts, floods); control of hazardous biological/chemical/hi-technological weapons, that can be purchased and dropped from planes, airborn offshore toward land by boats, planted in air systems, used upwind of anyone or group; transportation safety of vehicles such as planes, parts falling from them, riotous drunks, commercial plane routes over populous areas, disease control in all aspects, oil tankers safety, ferries, cruise ships; private and corporate workers with national security information and technological access; prohibition of private information; sports, humane treatment of animals; newsmedia's crimes; one currency system, banking; farmland 7th year rest to restore minerals and vitamins to our foods again; cults; ghoulish corporate medical business (chemical/biological/technological/ murder schemes to obtain blackmarket body parts, cloning, Medical Doctors as hitmen for assassin purposes, etc. Vey's experience with Health Care business problems extends to the states of CA, LA, VA, OH, NY, ILL, MD, PA, LA, TX, MN, CO, MA involving internationals.

*Leaders should submit their belief of whether our U.S. Constitutional Form of Government ENFORCED (not what they see in practice today) should be that one universal law system or which? Briefs in these matters can be submitted under Rule 37.2.

THE STATE OF OUR NATION (U.S.A.)

The urgent need for this Writ's granting are: Treason by leaders, Anarchy, Sedition, our government operating against our U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL FORM OF GOVERNMENT; Mafias infiltrating U.S. governments' systems through career politicians; biological/chemical/technological hazard control; Diplomatic Immunity outlawed, also mob-type politicians infiltrating our government system; unprosecuted crimes of leaders, the rich and powerful, a U.S. Senator's death (Sun Oil 18 USC § 37) and others (prejudicial justice system), numerous national security risks of information with ex-CIA, MILITARY, FBI, etc. illegal prosecutions for political purposes in America, polution a s a

whole (deadly toxic tobacco/nicotine/grills/trucks smoke outlawed, cults.

Vey has been fighting to CLEAN-UP the United States (with appropriate prosecutions of these blatant criminals), RESTORE law and order in the U.S., especially that of our U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL FORM OF GOVERNMENT and initiate ONE UNIVERSAL LAW SYSTEM: her RESCUE MISSION!

Since 1993, Vey has successfully accomplished a ONE LADY STING OPERATION of the illegal operation of the White House and many other criminally operated government systems, healthcare systems, et cetera, in the United States. This list will be presented in her Brief, if writ is granted. Moreover, she did this operation while suffering greatly with no assistance for legal and medical needs. Indeed, she was criminally abandoned by her government. THE EVIL DONE IS BEYOND HUMAN COMPREHENSION! The question of WHO IS RUNNING THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA will indeed be the question herein answered. **VEY will prove SEDITION, ANARCHY, TREASON in her Brief. SEE Vey's attached LAW APPENDIX!**

Moreover, there is the dilemna of Chinese, Russian, Mexican Mafias infiltrating our country. The invasion of Mexicans storming across our unprotected borders with their drug cartels, taking American's jobs, overturning our language Spanish second language in U.S. Is Mexico ANNEXING with The U.S.?

VEY'S DEMAND TO RETORE LAW & ORDER

Because of the illegal operation of the White House and conflict of interest of crimes therein committed, Vey demands that Court authorize Vey to take charge of Military, Justice Department, and place her as THE FILL-IN PRESIDENT, grant her necessary bench warrants for various officials, **when she justifies this action with proof of illegal activities and justifying her rightful leadership with U.S. LAW!**

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, the petitioner prays this Court will grant the writ.
Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Vey, Pro Se 7-15-99

Appendix 1

In The United States District Court
For The Western District Of Pennsylvania

EILEEN VEY, Plaintiff	)	
v.	)	C A No. 99-911
THE UNIVERSE & ALL THOSE INVOLVED IN OUTERSPACE & SKIES, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (THE EXECUTIVE, SENATE, JUDICIAL BRANCHES, INCLUSIVE OF ALL FEDERAL, STATE, COUNTY, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, ALL WORLD GOVENMENTS, THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE and UNITED NATIONS,	)	
Defendants.	)	

MEMORANDUM ORDER

This is another in a series of pro se in forma pauperis complaints initiated by the plaintiff, Eileen Vey.

The defendants include, inter alia, The Universe (governments & all those involved in outerspace & skiess, United States of America (the executive, senate, judicial branches, inclusive of the federal, state, county, local govenments), all world governments, the International Court of Justice and United Nations.

For relief, the plaintiff "seeks in excess of $50,000 and the above mentioned and (sic) previousl 11-year requests, although the World does not have enough money to pay her for abandoning her with no country all these years."

The gravamen of the plaintif's complaint is that she "can not (sic) receive medical attention anywhere, as she continuously goes to hospitals everywhere in The U.S.A. and has seen Medical Doctors from all over the World. Injured, reinjured with no attention namely Freddy Fu, M.D. for about seven (7) years."

The plaintiff further claims that she is therefore unable to "...complete her mission of Univesal Crime Clean-up, Law &

Order Restoration, et cetera." and "...can not (sic) complete her mission of a harmonious world and Universal Order with a Universal One Law System, because she has not appropriate access for all these long years."

The plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis has been granted and this action will be dismissed as being absolutely frivolous. 28 U.S.C. §§ !(!%(a) and 1915(b). See Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989) (complaint is frivolous where based on fanciful delusional factual scenario); Roman v. Jeffes, 904 F.2d 192, 194 n. 1 (3d Cir. 1990); Briebelbis v. Marks 675 F2d 579, 580 (3d Cir. 1982) (collecting cases).

NOW, THEREFORE, this 25th day of June, 1999, it is hereby

ORDERED that plaintff's complaint (Document No. 2) is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

Donald J. Lee
United States District Judge

cc Eileen Vey
804 Cedar Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15212-4812

Appendix 2

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
P. DOUGLAS SISK
CLERK

TELEPHONE
(215) 597-2995

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT
21400 UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE
601 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA 19106-1790

NOTICE

Re: VEY v. THE UNIVERSE

99-3532

CASE MANAGER: SUSAN M. ACERBA

TELEPHONE: 215-597-3014

Enclosed please find case opening information regarding the above-entitled appeal. All telephone inquires and written requests should be directed to the above named case manager.

LAW APPENDIX
with Definitions

MISPRISION - a neglect or wrong performance of official duty; maladministration by a public official.

ANARCHY- a state of lawlessness or political disorder due to the absence of governmental authority; absence of any authority, established order... Anarchy because the U.S. Constitutional Form of government, the U.S.'s authority and established order is being denied.

INSURRECTION- an act or instance of revolting against political or civil authority or **against an established government**. Insurrection because there is a revolt against our **U.S. Constitutional form** of government.

SEDITION- an insurrection against constituted authority. Sedition because there is an insurrection against the constituted authority of the U.S. Constitution and Federal laws' supremacy.

TREASON- the betrayal or a trust or confidence; the offence of attempting by overt acts to overthrow the government of the state to which an offender owes allegiance. Treason because allegiance is owed to justice for all and our U.S. Constitutional form of government.

§ 2381 TREASON- Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason and shall suffer death, or shall be imprisoned not less than five years and fined not less than $10, 000; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States.

§ 2383 REBELLION OR INSURRECTION- Whoever incites, sets on foot, assists, or engages in any rebellion or insurrection against the authority of the United States or the laws thereof, or gives aid or comfort thereto, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States.

§ 2384 SEDITIOUS CONSPIRACY- If two or more persons in any State or Territory, or in any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, conspire to overthrow, put down, or to destroy by force the Government of the United States, or to levy war against them, or to oppose by force the authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States.....

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
AUG 23 1999
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

☆☆☆

QUESTION PRESENTED

I.

WILL VEY FINALLY RECEIVE HER MEDICAL EMERGENCY INJUNCTION AFTER ALL THESE LONG YEARS OF DEPRIVATIONS OF MEDICAL TREATMENT.

PARTIES INVOLVED

Dr. Eileen Vey, Th.D., University Medical Center, University Presbyterian Hospital, its M.D.'s, Sports Medicine Center, and its conglomerates, and U.S. DEPT JUSTICE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBJECT	PAGE
Parties Involved	i
Table of Contents	ii
Petition for Writ	1
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	2
U.S. Constitutional Provision	2
Statement Case	2
REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT	2
CONCLUSION	5

☆☆

No. 98-1937

In The

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

AMERICA

October Term, 1998

VEY v. UNIVERSE, U.S.A., et al.

(Also, VEY v. PA Governor)

4TH SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

Writ of Certiorari (3RD Circuit)

Rule 11 & 12.4

MEDICAL EMERGENCY INJUNCTION REQUESTED

☆☆

The petitioner, Eileen Vey ("Vey"), hereby requests the granting of this Writ of Certiorari in her Universal Rescue Mission: Restoration of Law and Order and her establishing a UNIVERSAL ONE LAW SYSTEM as this case appeal has been dismissed AND requests an Emergency Medical Injunction.

OPINIONS BELOW

On June 25, 1999, the district Court denied this Mother case **Vey v. Universe, U.S.A. et al** DCWD of PA No. 99-911 (Appendix 1). On June 28, 1999, Vey appealed the case to the U.S. Court of Appeals (3RD), No. 99-3532, where its appeal was dismissed on August 19, 1999 (Appendix 2). This same case was coupled here with the subsidiary case, **Vey v. PA Governor**, under Rule 12.4 and 11, which is pending here and which involves a 5-year Medical Emergency Injunction, because such relief cannot be obtained anywhere else (Appendix 4 & 5).

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction is envoked under Rules 11 and 12.4, in that a pending case of public importance (universal jurisdiction) can be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court and that multiple writs of same matters (justice, law & order, etc) together can be appealed. As stated above, this Mother case was denied on August 19, 1999 and the Emergency Medical Injunction is a 5-year issue (Appendix 4 & 5). Because of the pattern of deprivation of medical treatment in Vey's multi-Hospital case, now includes West Virginia, in addition to CA, LA, VA, OH, NY, ILL, MD, PA LA, TX, MN, CO, MA, Vey needs a Mandamus/Prohibition to receive medical treatment. U.S. DEPT JUSTICE IS BEING SERVED!

U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Interplanetary Law, International Law, inclusive of Diplomatic Immunity, the entire United States Constitution and its Universal upholding against foreign infiltrating systems and conflicting lower law, which is the responsibility of this Court under its Linchpin, ARTICLE VI (2), Federal Supremacy Clause in these anarchial times! Moreover, it includes all laws written or unwritten which conflict with the U.S. CONSTITUTION. Hill-Burton Act.....

STATEMENT OF CASE

This complaint was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania on June , 1999, was denied on June 25, 1999, was appealed on June 28, 1999 to the U.S. Court of Appeals (3RD), No. 99-3532, where its appeal dismissed, because lower court is refusing the supremacy of The U.S. Supreme Court's Affidavit form, which it previously accepted.)

REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT

Very briefly, writ of certiorari should be granted, because lower courts has so departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings and sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power and for reasons that important extraordinary federal questions involved herein should be settled by this Court and that Medical Emergency Injunctive relief can be found nowhere.

THE UNIVERSAL CORPORATE MEDICAL BUSINESS AND ITS ILLS

As has been noted, this is a Universe Case dealing with all the ills of it, many of which the petitioner, Vey, wishes to correct. Included in this is the Universal medical business or healthcare business, which jurisdiction is just that and, therefore, can only be dealt with on that level.: Medicne, M.D.'s, medical equipment, all that is attached to that business interacts universally through satelite communications, internationally; even astronauts receive medical advise in space. For this reason also, we need a ONE UNIVERSAL LAW SYSTEM.

Vey has been to a multitude of hospitals at numerous states and turned away without medical treatment. Whether someone has prevented this is for the U.S. Justice Department to investigate, although the medical business and its ills should be addressed here: Hill-Burton Act, Medicaid, treatment. experimentations, etc., regardless of why Vey has been deprived treatment all these years and at so many places suspiciously. Suspiciously, because Vey has repeatedly seen in newspapers how a hospital would take a homeless person with nothing and perform very expensive operations on them (AGH about 1993).

However, for this reason and at this point in time, Vey submitts here a request for an Ex Parte Medical Emergency Injunction to University Presbyterian Hospital and its entire conglomerate of facilities and surgeons for treatment, so she can get out of her wheelchair and have whatever other medical treatment also neglected her. These needs has been denied her in hospitals and courts since about 1993.

PREREQUISITE FOR FRCP 65 (b) RELIEF

Vey has been in pain, in life-threatening situation by housing and lack of medical attention (crawls up steps-FIRE!) lack of medical attention can also be a sight (eyes) and limb threatening, left unattended. Vey has already suffered various injuries of periodic back, wrists, shoulder, hips, repatedly; now carpel tunnel, more floaters in eyes. Left in situation, where someone has been spraying chemicals out windows upwind of hers and under her window. It is believed that possible chemicals used are RAID type, PEPPER SPRAY, etc. is being used, as a local exterminator has been witnessed in a hate crime against Vey (Taylor). Also,

Allegheny General Hospital has a local medical warehouse, where anyone can break-in. Vey is allegic to tobacco smoke and this injures her health. (Smoke in her dwelling.)

Keeping Vey in a wheelchair all these years by depriving her of medical attention has prevented her from control over her living environment. The initial operation was done by Orthopedic surgeon of University Orthopedics and, therefore Vey demands that their best Orthopedic Surgeon, Freddy Fu, M.D. correct her knee problem, by issuing an Order for her treatment there.

I.
VEY HAS LEGAL GROUNDS FOR MEDICAL INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FRCP 65

Vey has had to run all over the country seeking medical treatment, because she is being deprived of Orthopedic Surgeon, Freddy Fu's services (Appendix 1-5)) at University Presbyterian Hospital and its subsidiaries. One of their hospital orthopedic surgeons originally did Vey's surgery gone bad operation at another hospital, and since then Vey had continued to seek their best Orthopedic surgeon, Fu, to correct the matter and been deprived his services under color of various excuses.

Because of her pain, living conditions,injuries, she submitted a Medical Emergency Injunction in compliance with FRCP 65. That is, she proved that she could be injured further if not treated and this treatment deprivations, not only kept her in a wheelchair all these unnecessary 7 years, but she developed carpel tunnel in hands, injury resulted without his treatment.

Vey requests that this Court Order the University Presbyterian conglomerate of services and namely, Freddy Fu, M.D. to her treatment and any other treatment needed at their expense. AGAIN, Vey lives on second floor and has to crawl up staircase to get to second floor room and danger all these years, if there where a FIRE. She continuously injures wrists, back living like this as she also can not afford other quarters, nor available, which is not the problem. Obtaining an Orthopedica Surgeon to correct her knees is the heart of the matter, as she only had a torn cartilege (MRI), when she began. Also, she wants Order for a new MRI for evidence.

Vey's Third Circuit Brief, No. 95-3571 Emergency Medical Injunction complied with the Third Circuit's criterion for Injunctive relief, See **Barton v. Eichelberger** (1970 CA3RD) 311 FS 1132 (MD); affirmed 451 F2d 263 and **Merchant & Evans v. Roosevelt**

Building Products, (1992 CA3RD) 963 F2d 628, 632.

Also, when Vey submitted the Hospital Case (Appendix 4 & 5), she requested "equal protection" of state case **Cardamone v. University of Pittsburgh** (1978) 253 PA Super. 65, 384 A2d 1232 (paid injured income monthly) to pay for medical costs, cost of living, inclusive of housing, until she is walking again.

II.

VEY MEETS U.S. SUPREME COURT'S CRITERION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Furthermore, Vey complied with the above procedural Rule FRCP 65 (b) for Injunctive Relief in the Third Circuit and with this U.S. Supreme Court's decisions:

Alexander v. "Americans United," Inc., 416 US 754,

> "Irreparable injury is the essential prerequisite for injunctive relief."

Truly v. Wanzer, 12 LEd 88,

> "To obtain an injunction, the right must be clear, the injury impending and threatened, so as to be averted only by the protecting preventive process of injunction."

Smith v. Robinson (US) 104 S Ct 3457:

> "Under either the Education of the Handicapped (20 USC § 1400 et, seq.) or 42 USC § 1983, a plaintiff is entitled to bypass the administratie process by obtaining injunctive relief only by showing that irreparable harm otherwise would result.

Because the above legal cites were never declared U.S. Unconstitutional, all are valid legal premise for relief.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, Vey prays that a Writ of Certiorari be granted and a MEDICAL EMERGENCY INJUNCTION be issued to M.D. Freddy Fu and according to the above requests.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Vey, Pro se

Appendix 1

In The United States District Court
For The Western District Of Pennsylvania

EILEEN VEY, Plaintiff	)	
v.	)	C A No. 99-911
THE UNIVERSE & ALL THOSE INVOLVED IN OUTERSPACE & SKIES, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (THE EXECUTIVE, SENATE, JUDICIAL BRANCHES, INCLUSIVE OF ALL FEDERAL, STATE, COUNTY, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, ALL WORLD GOVENMENTS, THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE and UNITED NATIONS,	)	
Defendants.	)	

MEMORANDUM ORDER

This is another in a series of pro se in forma pauperis complaints initiated by the plaintiff, Eileen Vey.

The defendants include, inter alia, The Universe (governments & all those involved in outerspace & skies, United States of America (the executive, senate, judicial branches, inclusive of the federal, state, county, local govenments), all world governments, the International Court of Justice and United Nations.

For relief, the plaintiff "seeks in excess of $50,000 and the above mentioned and (sic) previous 11-year requests, although the World does not have enough money to pay her for abandoning her with no country all these years."

The gravamen of the plaintiff's complaint is that she "can not (sic) receive medical attention anywhere, as she continuously goes to hospitals everywhere in The U.S.A. and has seen Medical Doctors from all over the World. Injured, reinjured with no attention namely Freddy Fu, M.D. for about seven (7) years."

The plaintiff further claims that she is therefore unable to "...complete her mission of Universal Crime Clean-up, Law &

Order Restoration, et cetera," and "...can not (sic) complete her mission of a harmonious world and Universal Order with a Universal One Law System, because she has not appropriate access for all these long years."

The plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis has been granted and this action will be dismissed as being absolutely frivolous. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(a) and 1915(b). See Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989) (complaint is frivolous where based on fanciful delusional factual scenario); Roman v. Jeffes, 904 F.2d 192, 194 n. 1 (3d Cir. 1990); Briebelbis v. Marks 675 F2d 579, 580 (3d Cir. 1982) (collecting cases).

NOW, THEREFORE, this 25th day of June, 1999, it is hereby ORDERED that plaintiff's complaint (Document No. 2) is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

Donald J. Lee
United States District Judge

cc Eileen Vey
804 Cedar Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15212-4812

Appendix 2

In The United States Court of Appeals
For The Third Circuit

EILEEN VEY,
Plaintiff,
v.

The Universe (Governments & All Those Involved In Outerspace & Skies), U.S.A., (Executive, Senate, Judicial Branches, Inclusive of All Federal, State, County, Local Governments), All World Governments, The International Court of Justice, The United Nations, Et Al.,
Defendants.

Civil Action
DC No. 99-911
CA3RD No. 99-3532

ORDER
THE MOTION IS DENIED. AN AFFIDAVIT SEEKING IFP STATUS OR PAYMENT OF FEES MUST BE RECEIVED WITHIN SEVEN (7) DAYS OF THE DATE OF ORDER OR THIS APPEAL WILL BE DISMISSED.
P. Douglas Sisk, Clerk
AUG 12 1999

MOTION FOR STAY, FRAP 62

AND NOW this 29th Day of July, 1999, the Appellant, Eileen Vey, hereby requests a STAY on this case pending an appeal to the U.S. SUPEME COURT under U.S. Supreme Court Rule 11, which decision will not be entered until the summer recess ends about October 1, 1999.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Vey

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Eileen Vey, hereby certify that a true and correct copy of this document was served on July 29, 1999 by prepaid first Class Mail as follows:

U.S. SOLICITOR GENERAL
DEPT OF JUSTICE ROOM 5614
950 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20530-0001

cc: EV
US DEPT JUSTIC

Eileen Vey, Pro Se
804 Cedar Avenue
Pittsburgh PA 15212

Appendix 3

In The United States District Court
For The Western District of Pennsylvania

EILEEN VEY, Plaintiff v.	:	
The Universe (Governments & All Those Involved In Outerspace & Skies), U.S.A., (The Executive, Senate, Judicial Branches, Inclusive of All Federal, State, County, Local Governments), All World Governments, The International Court of Justice, The United Nations, Et Al., Defendants.	:	No. 99-911

COMPLAINT

This is a multidistrict jurisdiction case in which the Plaintiff, Eileen Vey ("Vey") has a colossal complaint list of 15 years (state & local), 11 (federal), and approximately 2 years (worldwide or universally) hand has not received relief anywhere.

1. Vey can not receive medical attention anywhere, as she continously goes to hospitals everywhere in The U.S.A. and has seen Medical Doctors from all over the World. Injured, reinjured with no attention, namely Freddy Fu, M.D. for about seven (7) years.

2. Vey can not receive legal attention, as she continuously goes to courts practically everywhere in the U.S.A., The United Nations, and World Court (See Attached).

3. Vey can not complete her mission of Universal Crime Clean-up, Law & Order, Restoration, et cetera.

4. Vey can not complete her mission of a harmonious World and Universal Order, with a Universal One Law System, because she has not appropriate access for all these long years.

The list goes on and on, but what is the use of writing another list as previously, if she is denied access or relief again here? So, the Plaintiff Vey motions Court to grant IFP in district court and appellate courts above and expedite case in this last attempt for relief. Moreover, will the Court kindly tell Vey if the U.S. Solicitor General is enough to serve case at this time?

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction is envoked under 28 §§ 1330 and 1331.

Vey seeks in excess of $50,000 and the above mentioned and previous 11-year requests, although the World does not have enough money to pay her for abandoning her with no country all these years. Jury trial demanded.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Vey, Pro Se 5-30-99

CC: U.S. SOLICITOR GENERAL (CERTIFIED: CERTIFIED ATTACHED)

Appendix 4

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

EILEEN VEY, Plaintiff	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 94-1552
vs.	)	
JEFFREY ROMOFF, CEO PRESIDENT, AND JOHN F. DILLONiii, ADMIN. OF ORTHOPEDIC SURGERY, UNIV. PRESBYTERIAN HOSPITAL, et al., Defendants.	)	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 13th day of Sept., 1994, upon consideration of plaintff's Ex Parte Injunctive Relief Motion,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion is DENIED. This case shall proceed and service of the complaint shall be made on the defendants.

Donetta W. Ambrose
United States District Judge

CC: Eileen Vey

Appendix 5

IN THE UNITED STATES OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

95-3571

EILEEN VEY,
Appellant

v.

JEFFREY ROMOFF, CEO & PRES: JOHN F. DILLON, III, Admin. of Orthopedic Surgery, University Presbyterian Hospital; ANTHONY M. SANZO; JAMES H. McMASTERS, Chairman of Orthopedic Surgery, Alleghney Hospital; JOANNE MARIE ANDIORIO, Pres. of Mercy Hospital; JAMES BLOCK, Pres. of Johns Hopkins Hospital; MICHAEL A. WEST, CEO & PRES. OF AKRON GENERAL HOSPITAL, ET AL
Appellee

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Pennsylvania
D.C. Civil Action No. 94-cv-1552
(District Judge: Honorable Donetta W. Ambrose)

Submitted Under 3rd Circuit LAR 34.1 (a)
April 4, 1995
Before: BECKER, COWEN and ROTH, Circuit Judges

JUDGMENT ORDER

After consideration of all contentions raised by appellant, it is ADJUDGED AND ORDERED that the order of the district court of September 13, 1994 be and is hereby AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:
BECKER, Circuit Judge

Attest: P. Douglas Sisk, Clerk
Certified as a true copy and issued in
lieu of a formal mandate on June 12, 1995
Teste: P. Douglas Sisk, Clerk

Appendix 6

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 94-3571 February 1, 1995

EILEEN VEY, Appellant
v.
JEFFREY ROMOFF, et al.
(W.D. (Pittsburgh) of Pa. Civil No. 94-cv-1552 (DWA))
*

Present: MANSMANN and Cowen, Circuit Judges.

1. Motion by Appellant Pro Se to expedite appeal, for injunctive emergency medical relief of Dr. Fu, M.D., to supplement brief appendix and to expand the record with medical evidence of articles.

2. Motion by Appellant Pro Se to rule in favor of Appellant, to legally correct caption as Appellant intended it, for lawyer fees, and expand record for monthly income.

Anthony Infante 597-3137
Deputy Clerk

ORDER

THE MOTION TO EXPEDITE IS DENIED. THE REMAINING MOTIONS ARE REFERRED TO THE MERITS PANEL.

By The Court,

Carol Los Mansmann
Circuit Judge

Mar 18 1995

CC: EV
CWK